<center>**SIERRA SYSTEMS and WA OFFICE OF FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT**</center>

Grants, Contracts & Loans Feasibility Study Project
Meeting Notes: Project kickoff meeting
January 5, 2006

Attendees:

X	Allen Schmidt, OFM	X	Del Hontanosas, CTED
X	Susan Dodson (OFM)	X	John Hanson, CTED
X	Sharon Novak (OFM)	X	Kreighan McAuliffe, ECY
X	Debbie Stewart (ECY)	X	Gary Zeiler, ECY
X	David Koch (DIS)	X	John Saunders, Sierra Systems
X	Carol Baque, Sierra Systems	X	Tom Babington, Sierra Systems
X	Gary Hudson, Sierra Systems	X	Nathan Sims via teleconference

Agenda Items:
> **I.   Introductions**

Sharon introduced the project and each person introduced him/herself.

> **II.   Project Objectives, Constraints and Scope**

Project Objectives:
- Understand the core functional requirements for the first release of a grants, contracts and loans system – by June 2007, to:
    - Allow ECY to retire its current application for grants, contracts and loans by June 2007
    - Allow CTED and ECY to plan for other applications to meet requirements outside the core
    - Focus on ECY and CTED for this study and assume these will represent most of the core functional requirements
    - Involve other agencies enough to identify the "big" requirements not needed by ECY or CTED.
- Understand the core enterprise requirements for a grants, contracts and loans system, with a clear line between requirements that are agency-specific. Needs to be a clear distinction.
    - Consider the Roadmap modeling to represent broader financial requirements
- Understand the agency-specific requirements and how they can be accommodated in an enterprise system.
- Involve other agencies as feasible to review core requirements, e.g., review with the Roadmap focus group attendees for grants and contracts.
- Recommend the best grants, contracts and loans system solution to meet core requirements and accommodate agency-specific requirements.
- Plan for implementation of the recommended solution that allows:
    - Implementing in increments over time.
    - Expansion of functionality, including other types of contracts, in time.
- Prepare OFM and other agencies to answer questions about a grants, contracts and loans system in supplemental budget requests by February 17th.
- Prepare OFM and other agencies to request funding needed and answer questions about a grants, contracts and loans system in next biennium's budget.

Project Constraints
- The overall project timeline is very short.
- There is a hard deadline of February 17 for a product that can help answer questions for the supplemental budget request.
- The project has a budget for each deliverable.
- The Enterprise Roadmap Executive Committee (business architecture) needs to be aware of and understand the work of this project.
- The project must consider the emerging Enterprise Architecture (technical architecture) standards.

- Constraints on the solution include:
  - o Must meet core and accommodate agency-specific requirements.
  - o Must be feasible within a $3.1 million budget.
  - o Must be able to be implemented incrementally.
  - o Must meet enterprise security standards.
- Constraints on the solution implementation plan include:
  - o This is the first time a team has been formed to implement a Roadmap system. The plan must include time to build team processes and strong team leadership.

Allen stated that enterprise interests are to be blended into the solution. It is not necessary to wait for a broader enterprise solution.

Sharon's Action Item: Send a copy of the Enterprise System for Grants Contracts and Loans Management budget to Carol. **Follow-on:** Done

Project Scope
Scope of the feasibility study is given in the Work Request:

- For Grants Management, the study will address the functions of applying for grants, evaluating and awarding grants, daily grants/project management, payments, closures, and reporting/queries.
- For Contracts Management, the study will address the functions of documenting and establishing contracts, daily contracts management, payments, closures, and reporting/queries.
- For Loans Management, the study will address the functions of accounts payable for loans (It is expected that other systems will address the other functions of loans management.)

Also:
- The application for a grant by a recipient is in scope.
- Accounts Receivable functionality is out of scope – no in-bound money.
- Procurement and contract award are not in scope.
- The only Accounts Payable functionality in scope is whatever is needed to accommodate grants. The piece implemented for grants may be replaced when enterprise financial solutions are implemented.   (A/P is the first thing the Roadmap will address next biennium.)
- Only sub-grants are in scope (page 2 of the grant "to be" process model).

III.   Project Structure
Sharon distributed a diagram of the structure of the Enterprise System for Grants, Contracts and Loans Management. It shows:
- *Project Sponsor* – Sadie Hawkins. She will make decisions and decide what solution is recommended.
- *Executive Steering Committee* – includes the Sponsor and executives from ECY, CTED and DIS.
- *OFM Business Manager* – Allen Schmidt
- *Related Projects*: Business Process Redesign, Roadmap Liaison, and Project Quality Assurance. QA will be contracted from a standing contract.
- *OFM Enterprise Architect and Security Analyst*
- *OFM Project Manager* – Sharon Novak
- *ECY Internal Project Manager* – Kreighan McAuliffe – to work on ECY unique processes
- *CTED Internal Project Manager* – Del Hontanosas – to work on CTED unique processes
- *User Group* – includes many of the meeting attendees
- *Feasibility Study Consultant* - Sierra Systems
- *Support* for Common Core Processes, including Product Managers, Business Leads at ECY and CTED, System Support, Developers, Testers, and Other Agencies' staff as assigned.

Carol listed the working project team members: Kreighan from ECY and Del from CTED, Tom Babington, Gary Hudson, Kent Wilmot and Nathan Sims.

IV.   Approach, Deliverable and Schedule
Carol briefly listed the deliverables:
- *Project Plan* – this is in progress now. The plan will include the results of this meeting and sample deliverable tables of contents. The Plan will be sent to the User Group for review.
- *Definition of Requirements* – Sharon has set up many interviews over the next two weeks. The team will draw out functional (including functional Roadmap requirements), non-functional and technical requirements.
- *Business Case* – this will include a preliminary statement for February 17th.
- *Alternatives Analysis and Recommendation* – the recommendation may be conditional based on Roadmap progress. The recommendation should also include "enablers" for the solution, e.g., a robust A/P system available; availability of eSignatures; contract information within AFRS.
- Implementation Plan Documents: *Conceptual Design*, *Work Plan*, *Risk Plan*.

The Berk study by JLARC has just published its findings on better management and tracking of grants.

Sharon's Action Item: Send a copy of the Berk study report to Carol. **Follow-on:** Link sent

V.   Acceptance Process and Criteria
Because the project is on such a tight timeline, feedback on deliverables will be sent for review will be expected within two or three days. One set of revisions will complete the deliverable. Carol will describe the deliverables and the acceptance process for them in Deliverable Expectation Documents, appendices to the Project Plan document.

VI.   Project Management
Issues, Changes and Risks will be managed closely. The terms will be described in the Project Plan document.
Project Risks:
- Definitions of terms differ widely and could impede understanding and progress. The sooner we can use common terminology, the better. The Roadmap project does not yet have a common lexicon. This project will need to maintain a glossary and work through the Roadmap to maintain as much consistency as possible.
- Scope expansion will endanger deadlines.
- Decisions will have to be made timely to keep to a schedule. The recommendation may take time. Meetings should be scheduled early.
- Review by stakeholders will take time. Need to manage closely and limit the cycle of review.
- Dependencies on project in progress, e.g., Roadmap and enterprise architecture standards, will require us to go forward with potentially incomplete information. The "to be" process models will be updated Monday.
- The definition of "core" requirements may be difficult to reach across agencies. Criteria for deciding will have to be set up.

Sharon's/Carol's Action Item: Set up meetings for requirements review and recommendation decision.

Communication: Sharon will send draft documents through this group. She asked that communication come through her to the other stakeholders.

VII.   Success Criteria
Carol will list the project objectives discussed at the beginning of the meeting in the Project Plan document.

VIII.   Planned Absences
Carol asked that anyone who had more than two days' absence planned let her know.   None of the working team members had conflicts, except:
Tom Babington   2/16 – 2/20
Nathan Sims   1/22 – 1/27